arXiv:1703.08887v1 [math.PR] 27 Mar 2017

Nonlinear Large Deviations: Beyond the Hypercube

Jun Yan

Tuesday 28th March, 2017

Abstract

We present a framework to calculate large deviations for nonlinear functions of independent random variables supported on compact sets in Banach spaces, by extending the result in Chatterjee and Dembo [6]. Previous research on nonlinear large deviations has only focused on random variables supported on $\{-1,+1\}^n$, a small subset of random objects people usually study, thus it is of natural interest and need to research the corresponding theory for random variables with general distributions. Since our results put fewer constraints on the random variables, it has considerable flexibility in application. To show this, we provide examples with continuous and high dimensional random variables. Our framework could also be used to verify the mathematical rigor of the mean field approximation method; to demonstrate, we verify the mean field approximation for a class of spin vector models.

1 Introduction

Large deviations theory for the linear function of i.i.d. random objects has long been studied, see Dembo and Zeitouni [10] and references therein. Since the linear function is the simplest class of functions to analyze and only accounts for a small subset of functions people usually study, it is of natural interest to explore a corresponding theory for nonlinear functions. Recently, a nonlinear large deviations framework was built in Chatterjee and Dembo [6], where the authors deal with the large deviation principles for nonlinear functions of i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables. The main theorem in [6] gives error bounds of the mean field approximation of $\mathrm{E}_\mu e^{f(X_1,\ldots,X_n)}$ where μ is the uniform distribution on $\{-1,+1\}^n$. The error bounds consist of two parts: the complexity terms which involve the covering number of ∇f, and the smoothness terms which involve the first two derivatives of f. Motivated by [6], Eldan [12] comes up with a different nonlinear large deviations framework to deal with nonlinear functions of i.i.d. random variables supported on $\{-1,+1\}^n$. In [12], instead of the covering number of ∇f, a different notion of complexity called Gaussian width of the discrete gradient of f is introduced, and there f is not required to have the second derivative. In [6] many exciting applications are presented, suggesting the strong power of the new framework. With the different method, [12] gets stronger results for the examples in [6]. However, all of the examples in [6] and [12] concern random variables with distributions supported on $\{-1,+1\}^n$, a small subset of random objects people usually study in probability theory. Thus it is natural to

research whether a similar nonlinear large deviations regime works for random objects with more general distributions, and we can expect it since the Bernoulli random variable should not be special. Indeed, a framework similar to [6] is used in Basak and Mukherjee [2] to verify the universality of the mean field approximation on the Potts model.

In this work, we extend the framework of [6] to independent random variables with distributions compactly supported in Banach spaces. Similar to [6], our main result (Theorem 1) gives error bounds for the mean field approximation of $\mathrm{E}_\mu e^{f(X_1,...,X_n)}$, where $\mu = \mu_1 \times ... \times \mu_n$ could be more general than [6]. Our result has considerable flexibility in application, because: (1) μ_i's could be defined on general Banach spaces, thus there is no dimension constraint on the supports of μ_i's; (2) μ_i's are not required to be discrete; (3) $X_1, ..., X_n$ are not required to be i.i.d. - only independence is needed. To show this flexibility we provide examples with high dimensional and continuous random variables, including an example in which the dimension of the support of μ_i's is changing with n; previous methods don't work on these examples. The proof sketch of our main result (Theorem 1) is similar to the one in [6]; however in [6] special calculations for the product Bernoulli distribution are used, and we find general arguments for Banach spaces. While our result works for general problems, we propose that for specific problems the error bounds in Theorem 1 could be improved by utilizing the particular structures of the problems. As an example, we extend the result of [2] and verify the mathematical rigor of the mean field approximation for a larger class of spin vector models. Note that it will also naturally be of interest to extend the framework in [12] for general distributions. However, when proving theorems for distributions supported on $\{-1, 1\}^n$, [12] constructs a Brownian motion running on $[-1, 1]^n$, such that whenever a facet of $[-1, 1]^n$ is hit the corresponding coordinate stop moving. In this way the Brownian motion ends up at $\{-1, 1\}^n$ uniformly, and we can change the distribution of the ending point by adding a drift to the Brownian motion. Currently it is not clear what the corresponding objects should be for general supports.

1.1 The main result

Before stating the main theorem we introduce several definitions. For each $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$, we consider the probability space $(V_i, \mathcal{B}_i, \mu_i)$, where V_i is a Banach space and $\mathcal{B}_i$ is the Borel σ-algebra generated by its open sets. We assume that for each i, there exists a compact set W_i in V_i such that $\mu_i(W_i) = 1$. Consider the product probability measure μ on the product space W in V where

$$\mu := \mu_1 \times \mu_2 \times ... \times \mu_n,\ W := W_1 \times W_2 \times ... \times W_n,\ V := V_1 \times V_2 \times ... \times V_n.$$

We consider a function $f(x_1, ..., x_n)$ on V, which we assume to be twice Fréchet differentiable. That is, $\forall i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ and $x = (x_1, ..., x_n) \in V$, $\exists$bounded linear function $f_i(x) : V_i \to R$, such that

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{|\ f(x_1, ..., x_i + h, ..., x_n) - \ f(x_1, ..., x_i, ..., x_n) - f_i(x_1, ..., x_n)(h)|}{\|h\|} = 0.$$

And $\forall i, j \in \{1, ..., n\}$, $\exists$bounded linear function $f_{ij}(x) : V_i \times V_j \to R$, such that

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{| \ f_i(x_1, ..., x_j + h, ..., x_n)(z) - \ f_i(x_1, ..., x_j, ..., x_n)(z) - f_{ij}(x_1, ..., x_n)(h, z)|}{\|h\|} = 0, \forall z \in V_j.$$

We further define the operator norms of the first two derivatives of f as

$$\|f_i\| := \sup_{\|h\| \leq 1} |f_i(x_1, ..., x_n)(h)|, \|f_{ij}\| := \sup_{\max\{\|h\|, \|z\|\} \leq 1} |f_{ij}(x_1, ..., x_n)(h, z)|, \forall i, j \in \{1, ..., n\}.$$

For more properties about Fréchet differentials, see [8]. We assume that they are bounded on W_i and $W_i \times W_j$ with

$$|f| \leq a, \ \ \|f_i\| \leq b_i, \ \ \|f_{ij}\| \leq c_{ij}, \ \forall i, j \in \{1, ..., n\}.$$

Since W_i's are assumed to be compact, we can find $M > 0$ such that $\forall i$,

$$\forall x, y \in W_i, \ \ \|x - y\| \leq M. \tag{1.1}$$

For any product measure $\nu = \nu_1 \times \nu_2 \times ... \times \nu_n$ on W, we denote $m(\nu_i)$ as the mean of ν_i: $m(\nu_i) := E_{\nu_i} Z$ where Z obeys ν_i, that is,

$$\forall \text{ bounded linear functional } h \text{ on } V_i, \ E_{\nu_i} h(Z) = h(m(\nu_i)).$$

The existence of $m(\nu_i)$ is guaranteed by the fact that μ_i concentrates on the compact set W_i, for example see Chapter 2 in [17]. Assume that we can find a set of bounded linear function vectors $D(\epsilon) = \{g_\alpha = (g_{\alpha 1}, ..., g_{\alpha n}), \alpha \in I\}$, where $g_{\alpha i}$ is a bounded linear functional on W_i for any α and i, such that for any $x = (x_1, ..., x_n) \in W$, there exists a $d = (d_1, ..., d_n) \in D(\epsilon)$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|f_i(x) - d_i\|^2 \leq \epsilon^2 n. \tag{1.2}$$

Following is the main theorem, which gives upper and lower bounds of the mean field approximation for $\log E_\mu e^f$.

Theorem 1. *With the notations above, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \int_W e^{f(x_1, ..., x_n)} d\mu(x) \\ \leq & \max_{\nu \ll \mu, \nu = \nu_1 \times \nu_2 \times ... \times \nu_n} \left\{ f(m(\nu_1), ..., m(\nu_n)) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} D(\nu_i \parallel \mu_i) \right\} + B + D + \log 2 + \log |D(\epsilon)|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$B \ : = 4 \left(M^2 \left(a \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{ii} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i^2 \right) + M^3 \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} b_i c_{ij} + M^4 \left(a \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} c_{ij}^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} b_i b_j c_{ij} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{1.3}$$

$$D \quad := \quad = 4\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i^2 + \epsilon^2 n\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(M^3\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{ii}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + M^2 n^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} M^2 c_{ii} + Mn\epsilon. \tag{1.4}$$

Moreover,

$$\log \int_W e^{f(x_1,\ldots,x_n)} d\mu(x) \geq \max_{\nu \ll \mu, \nu = \nu_1 \times \nu_2 \times \ldots \times \nu_n} \left\{ f(m(\nu_1), \ldots, m(\nu_n)) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} D(\nu_i \parallel \mu_i) \right\} - \frac{M^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{ii}.$$

Remark 1 (of Theorem 1)**.** *A slight improvement is: Let* $B_3 := \sup_{x \in W} \|f_i(x)\|^2$*, then obviously* $B_3 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i^2$*. We can improve* D *to* $\widetilde{D}$ *defined as follows*

$$\widetilde{D} := 4\left(B_3 + \epsilon^2 n\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(M^3\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{ii}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + M^2 n^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} M^2 c_{ii} + Mn\epsilon.$$

For Bernoulli(p) μ_i's, Theorem 1 is merely Theorem 1.5 in [6] with slight modifications. We give the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 2.

1.2 Applications

1.2.1 Subgraph counts in the edge colored random graph

The edge colored complete graph is an important object in Combinatorics, for example see Ramsey's Theorem. People have studied this kind of graphs from different perspectives, for example see [1], [13] and [7]. On the other hand, the large deviations for subgraph counts in random graph has been studied in Probability, for example see [14], [3] and [5]. In this example, we consider the large deviation for the number of single-color subgraphs in an edge colored random graph. More precisely, we consider a complete graph G with N vertices, and assume that each edge of G has a color which is i.i.d. uniformly chosen from l colors. For any fixed finite simple graph H, we denote $T(H, G)$ as the number of homomorphisms of H into G whose edges are of the same color. We investigate the large deviation of $T(H, G)$. We formulate the problem as follows: consider a random vector $X = (X_{ij})_{1 \leq i < j \leq N}$, where X_{ij}'s are i.i.d. chosen from $\{(1, 0, 0, \ldots, 0), \ldots, (0, 0, \ldots, 1)\}$ (the length of each vector is l), and we call this distribution μ_{ij}. Let m be the number of edges of H, Δ be the maximum degree of H, and k be the number of vertices of H. Let $X_{ij} = X_{ji}$, and denote

$$T(x) := \sum_{q \in [N]^k} \sum_{s=1}^{l} \prod_{\{r,r'\} \in E} x_{q_r q_{r'} s},$$

where E is the edge set of H. It is clear that T is the number of H's in G with same color edges. We show that

Theorem 2. *With the notations above, for any $u > 1$, as $N \to \infty$ we have*

$$P(T(x) \geq uET(X)) \leq \exp\left(-\psi_l(u)(1+o(1))\right), \text{ when } l \leq N^{1/(19+8m+21\Delta)},$$

$$P(T(x) \geq uET(X)) \geq \exp\left(-\psi_l(u)(1+o(1))\right), \text{ when } l \leq N^{1/(2\Delta+m+2))}(\log N)^{-1},$$

where

$$\psi_l(u) := \inf\{\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq N}\sum_{s=1}^{l} x_{ijs}\log\frac{x_{ijs}}{1/l} : x_{ij} \in W,\ T(x) \geq uET(X)\},$$

and

$$W := \{(z_1,...,z_l) : \sum_{i=1}^{l} z_i = 1, z_i \geq 0, i = 1,...,l\}. \tag{1.5}$$

We give the proof of Theorem 2 in Section 3.1.

1.2.2 Triangle counts with continuous edge weights

The large deviation principle for the triangle counts in random graph has been studied for a long time. People study this problem for both dense Erdős-Rényi random graph $G(N,p)$, in which p is fixed ([4]), and sparse Erdős-Rényi random graph $G(N,p)$, in which p goes to 0 as n goes to ∞ ([15], [14], [9], [11], [6], [12]). See Chatterjee [5] for more discussions and references. Here we consider the continuous version of the triangle counts problem in the dense random graph. That is, let G be a complete graph with N vertices. For each edge $\{i,j\}$, we assign a weight x_{ij} (assume $x_{ij} = x_{ji}$) on it. Assume that $\{x_{ij}, i<j\}$ are i.i.d. from $U(0,1)$. Denote the number of weighted triangles in G as

$$T(x) := \sum_{q\in[N]^3}\prod_{\{r,r'\}\in E} x_{q_r q_{r'}},$$

where $E = \{\{1,2\},\{2,3\},\{3,1\}\}$. For any $a \in (0,1)$, we define ν^a as the truncated exponential distribution with mean a and parameter λ_a, that is,

$$p_{\nu^a}(z) = \frac{\lambda_a e^{-\lambda_a z}}{1-e^{-\lambda_a}} \text{ for } z \in (0,1), \text{ with } \lambda_a \text{ s.t. } E_{\nu^a}(Z) = a.$$

Then by direct calculation, the KL divergence between ν^a and $U(0,1)$ is

$$D(\nu^a||U) = \int_0^1 \frac{\lambda_a e^{-\lambda_a x}}{1-e^{-\lambda_a}}\log(\frac{\lambda_a e^{-\lambda_a x}}{1-e^{-\lambda_a}})dx = -1 + \frac{\lambda_a e^{-\lambda_a}}{1-e^{-\lambda_a}} + \log(\frac{\lambda_a}{1-e^{-\lambda_a}}).$$

Write $n = N(N-1)/2$ as the number of edges in G. Define

$$\psi_n(u) := \inf\{\sum_{i<j}(-1 + \frac{\lambda_{y_{ij}} e^{-\lambda_{y_{ij}}}}{1-e^{-\lambda_{y_{ij}}}} + \log(\frac{\lambda_{y_{ij}}}{1-e^{-\lambda_{y_{ij}}}})) : y_{ij} = y_{ji} \in (0,1) \text{ such that } T(y) \geq uET(X)\}.$$

We show that

Theorem 3. *With the notations above, for any* $1 < u < 8$,

$$P(T(x) \geq uET(X)) = \exp\left(-\psi_n(u)(1+o(1))\right) \text{ as } N \to \infty.$$

We give the proof of Theorem 3 in Section 3.2.

Remark 2 (of Theorem 1)**.** *The bounds in Theorem 1 are not guaranteed and have no reason to be optimal; they could be improved case by case by utilizing particular structures of specific problems. For instance, in the proof of Theorem 1,* B *appears where we want to control* $f(x) - f(\widehat{x})$ *and* $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x^{(i)})(x_i - \widehat{x}_i)$*, and it is possible to find better bounds for these terms in specific problems. Similar arguments apply to* D*. Further, it is possible to find suitable replacements for other elements in the proof of Theorem 1, for example* p^x*. We provide the following example to show this.*

1.2.3 Mean field approximation on a class of spin vector models

Mean field approximation is an important method derived from Physics, and it has been applied to many different fields. See [18] or [2] for an introduction to this method. Like other methods in Statistical Physics, its mathematical rigor is not gauranteed and needs to be verified for specific models. In [2] the universality of the mean field approximation for a class of Potts model is verified. Our following theorem extends the result in [2] to a more general setting.

Theorem 4. *Let* X_i*'s be i.i.d. random variables from distributions* μ_i*'s defined on a compact set* W *in* R^N *for* $N \geq 1$*, and write the product measure as* $\mu := \mu_1 \times ... \times \mu_n$*. Let* J *be a symmetric* $N \times N$ *matrix,* h *be a vector with length* N*, and for each* n *let* A_n *be a symmetric* $n \times n$ *matrix. Define the Hamiltonian as*

$$H_n^{J,h}(x) := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^n A_{n(i,j)} x_i^T J x_j + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^T h. \tag{1.6}$$

Then if the sequence of matrices A_n *satisfies*

$$tr(A_n^2) = o(n) \text{ and } \sup_{x\in[0,1]^n} \sum_{i\in[n]} \left| \sum_{j\in[n]} A_n(i,j)x_j \right| = O(n), \tag{1.7}$$

we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\left[\int_{W^n} e^{H_n^{J,h}(x_1,...,x_n)} d\mu(x) - \max_{\nu \ll \mu, \nu = \nu_1\times\nu_2\times...\times\nu_n,} \left\{ H_n^{J,h}(m(\nu_1),...,m(\nu_n)) - \sum_{i=1}^n D(\nu_i \parallel \mu_i) \right\} \right] = 0. \tag{1.8}$$

Remark 3 (of Theorem 4)**.** *If we let* μ_i*'s be the uniform distribution on* $\{(1,0,0,...,0),...,(0,0,...,1)\}$ *(all the vectors have length* $N \geq 2$*), then we get the Potts model and Theorem 4 is just Theorem 1.1 in [2].*

Theorem 4 covers a large class of models in Statistical Physics. In the simple case of $A_n(i,j) = 1/n$, it is easy to verify that condition (1.7) holds, and $N = 1, 2, 3$ correspond to the mean field Curie-Weiss model, XY model and Heisenberg model respectively. The validity of the mean field approximation for these mean field models has long been known; because the Hamiltonian could be expressed as a function of $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i$, people have already studied them with large deviations tools, for example see [16] and [10]. See [2] for more discussion and examples of cases where $A_n(i,j)$ are not all the same. A direct application of Theorem 4 is letting μ_i be the uniform distribution on the sphere S^N, which people usually study in Statistical Physics and is not covered by [2].

If we directly apply Theorem 1 to the setting above, we will find that (1.8) is stronger than what we can get from Theorem 1. In order to prove Theorem 4, we need to incorporate the special properties of $H_n^{J,h}$. We give the proof of Theorem 4 in section 3.4.

Section 2 below is the proof of Theorem 1. The sketch of this proof is similar to the one in [6]; however in [6] special properties and calculations for the Bernoulli distribution are used, and here we build general arguments. Important parts in the extensions are: (1) Section 2.2.1, where we show several useful properties of measure v with linear $\log\frac{dv}{d\mu}(\cdot)$; these properties are used later in Section 2.3.3. (2) Section 2.2.2, where we construct a convering set $D'(\epsilon)$ based on $D(\epsilon)$, and show that $D'(\epsilon)$ is a good covering of $\{\widehat{x}(x)\colon\ x \in W\}$ defined in 2.12. (3) A suitable way to bound the approximation (2.31) by decompositions in (2.32) and (2.33), which are different from the decompositions in [6] and make things work in the general setting.

2 Proof of Theorem 1

We devide the proof into the upper bound part and the lower bound part. The lower bound part is relatively easy and we state it first.

2.1 The lower bound part

Proof. For any $\nu = \nu_1 \times \nu_2 \times ... \times \nu_n$, by the Gibbs variational principle, we have

$$\log \int_W e^{f(x_1,...,x_n)} d\mu(x) \geq \int_W f(x_1,...,x_n) d\nu(x) - D(\nu \parallel \mu). \tag{2.1}$$

Because ν and μ are both product measures, we have the following decomposition

$$D(\nu \parallel \mu) = \sum_{i=1}^n D(\nu_i \parallel \mu_i). \tag{2.2}$$

For every i, let $x^{(i)} = (x_1, ..., x_{i-1}, \theta_i, x_{i+1}, ..., x_n)$, where θ_i is a fixed point in W_i. Writing the mean of ν as

$$m(\nu) = (m(\nu_1), m(\nu_2), ..., m(\nu_n)),$$

then by the definition of $m(\nu_i)$ we have $\int_W f_i(tx^{(i)}+(1-t)m(\nu))(x_i-m(\nu_i))d\nu(x)=0$, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left|\int_W f_i(tx+(1-t)m(\nu))(x_i-m(\nu_i))d\nu(x)\right| \\ = & \left|\int_W \left(f_i(tx+(1-t)m(\nu))-f_i(tx^{(i)}+(1-t)m(\nu))\right)(x_i-m(\nu_i))d\nu(x)\right| \\ \leq & \int_W c_{ii}\times\|tx_i-t\theta_i\|\times\|x_i-m(\nu_i)\|\,d\nu(x)\leq tc_{ii}M^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

By (2.3) and the expression $f(x)-f(m(\nu))=\sum_{i=1}^n\int_0^1 f_i(tx+(1-t)m(\nu))(x_i-m(\nu_i))dt$, we further get

$$\int_W (f(x)-f(m(\nu)))\,d\nu(x)\geq -\sum_{i=1}^n\int_0^1 tc_{ii}M^2dt=-\frac{M^2}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n c_{ii}. \tag{2.4}$$

Plugging (2.2) and (2.4) into (2.1), we get

$$\log\int_W e^{f(x_1,\ldots,x_n)}d\mu(x)\geq -\frac{M^2}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n c_{ii}+f(m(\nu_1),\ldots,m(\nu_n))-\sum_{i=1}^n D(\nu_i\parallel\mu_i).$$

Taking the sup over $\nu=\nu_1\times\nu_2\times\ldots\times\nu_n$ with $\nu\ll\mu$ completes the proof. □

2.2 The upper bound part

2.2.1 Pre-analysis: Definition of the measure ν^y

Before proving the upper bound part of Theorem 1, let's take a look at the term

$$\max_{\nu\ll\mu,\nu=\nu_1\times\nu_2\times\ldots\times\nu_n}\left\{f(m(\nu_1),\ldots,m(\nu_n))-\sum_{i=1}^n D(\nu_i\parallel\mu_i)\right\}. \tag{2.5}$$

In order to achieve the maximum, a natural question one might ask is: when $(m(\nu_1),\ldots,m(\nu_n))$ is fixed, what is the minimum value of $\sum_{i=1}^n D(\nu_i\parallel\mu_i)$? Here we explore some properties of measures with fixed expectation. For every $y=(y_1,\ldots,y_n)\in W$, we consider the following problem:

$$\min\left\{\sum_{i=1}^n D(\nu_i\parallel\mu_i)\text{: }\nu\text{ is a product probability measure with }\nu\ll\mu\text{ and }m(\nu)=y\right\}. \tag{2.6}$$

In this subsection, we show several properties of the minimizer of (2.6). We prove that:

Proposition 1. *For each i, if a measure ν_i^y satisfies that $\nu_i^y\ll\mu_i$, $m(\nu_i^y)=y_i$ and*

$$\frac{d\nu_i^y}{d\mu_i}(z)=e^{R_i(z)}\text{ for a linear functional }R_i(\cdot)\text{ on }V_i, \tag{2.7}$$

Then $\nu^y:=\nu_1^y\times\nu_2^y\times\ldots\times\nu_n^y$ achieves the minimum in (2.6).

Proof. For each i, assume that ν_i satisfies the conditions above. For another measure $\widetilde{\nu}_i$ with $m(\widetilde{\nu}_i) = y_i$ and $\widetilde{\nu}_i \ll \mu_i$, noting that from (2.7) $\log \frac{d\nu_i}{d\mu_i}(\cdot)$ is linear, thus we have

$$\int_{W_i} \frac{d\widetilde{\nu}_i}{d\mu_i}(x) \log \frac{d\nu_i}{d\mu_i}(x) d\mu_i = \int_{W_i} \frac{d\nu_i}{d\mu_i}(x) \log \frac{d\nu_i}{d\mu_i}(x) d\mu_i = D(\nu_i \parallel \mu_i). \tag{2.8}$$

Combining (2.8) with the fact that $D(\widetilde{\nu}_i \parallel \nu_i) \geq 0$, we have

$$0 \leq D(\widetilde{\nu}_i \parallel \nu_i) = \int_{W_i} \frac{d\widetilde{\nu}_i}{d\mu_i}(x) \log \frac{\frac{d\widetilde{\nu}_i}{d\mu_i}(x)}{\frac{d\nu_i}{d\mu_i}(x)} d\mu_i = D(\widetilde{\nu}_i \parallel \mu_i) - D(\nu_i \parallel \mu_i),$$

and it completes the proof. □

Now let's consider the properties of ν^y satisfying the conditions of Proposition 1. From (2.7) we can see that $\forall z \in W_i$,

$$\log \frac{d\nu_i^y}{d\mu_i}(z) = R_i(z). \tag{2.9}$$

Recalling that $E_{\nu_i^y} z = m(\nu_i^y)$, by (2.7) and (2.9), we see that

$$D(\nu_i^y \parallel \mu_i) = \int_{W_i} \frac{d\nu_i^y}{d\mu_i}(x) \log \frac{d\nu_i^y}{d\mu_i}(x) d\mu_i(x) = \int_{W_i} R_i(z) d\nu_i^y(x) = R_i(m(\nu_i^y)). \tag{2.10}$$

We will use (2.9) and (2.10) later.

2.2.2 The construction of $D'(\epsilon)$

In the following, similar to [6] we define $\widehat{x}(x)$ for each $x \in W$, and construct a covering $D'(\epsilon)$ of $\{\widehat{x}(x) : x \in W\}$. We define $\widetilde{\mu}$ on W such that

$$\frac{d\widetilde{\mu}}{d\mu}(x) = \frac{e^{f(x_1,\ldots,x_n)}}{\int_W e^{f(x_1,\ldots,x_n)} d\mu(x)}, \ \forall x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in W. \tag{2.11}$$

For every $x \in W$ we let

$$\widehat{x}_i(x) := E_{\widetilde{\mu}} \left[X_i \mid X_j = x_j \text{ for } j \neq i \right]. \tag{2.12}$$

In order to construct the covering of $\{\widehat{x}(x)\colon x \in W\}$, for any $d = (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n) \in D(\epsilon)$ we construct a corresponding $p(d) = (p(d)_1, p(d)_2, \ldots, p(d)_n) \in W$ in the following way: for each $x \in W$ we define

$$\widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x) := d_i(x_i), \tag{2.13}$$

and let

$$p(d)_i := \frac{\int x_i e^{\widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x)} d\mu_i}{\int e^{\widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x)} d\mu_i}, \ p(d) := (p(d)_1, \ldots, p(d)_n). \tag{2.14}$$

Note that the existence of $\widehat{x}_i(x)$ and $p(d)_i$ is guaranteed by the fact that W_i is compact. Define

$$D'(\epsilon) := \{p(d) : \ d \in D(\epsilon)\}.$$

For each x, we denote

$$d^x := d \in D(\epsilon) \text{ s.t. } \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|f_i(x) - d_i\|^2 \leq \epsilon^2 n, \tag{2.15}$$

then with (2.14) we can further define

$$p^x := (p_1^x, p_2^x, ..p_n^x) := p(d^x). \tag{2.16}$$

In the following we bound $\sum_{i=1}^n \|\widehat{x}_i - p_i^x\|^2$, so that $D'(\epsilon)$ is a covering of $\widehat{x}$. Let

$$p_i^x(t) := \frac{\int x_i e^{tf(x)+(1-t)\widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x)} d\mu_i}{\int e^{tf(x)+(1-t)\widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x)} d\mu_i},$$

then $p_i^x(t)$ is an interpolation between p_i^x and $\widehat{x}_i$ since

$$p_i^x(0) = p_i^x, p_i^x(1) = \widehat{x}_i. \tag{2.17}$$

Let

$$e(x,i) := \frac{\widehat{x}_i - p_i^x}{\|\widehat{x}_i - p_i^x\|}, \ V_{x,i} = \{ke(x,i) : k \in K\}, \tag{2.18}$$

where K is the field of scalars of V, which is R or C. Then clearly $V_{x,i}$ is a 1-dimension subspace of V_i. Define a linear functional g_0 on $V_{x,i}$ as

$$g_0(ke(x,i)) = k, \tag{2.19}$$

then obviously $\|g_0\| = 1$. By the Hahn-Banach theorem, we can extend g_0 to g defined on V_i such that

$$g(z) = g_0(z) \text{ for each } z \in V_{x,i}, \ \|g\| = \|g_0\| = 1. \tag{2.20}$$

Thus for any $z_1, z_2 \in W_i$ we have

$$|g(z_1) - g(z_2)| \leq \|z_1 - z_2\|. \tag{2.21}$$

Writing $x_z^{(i)} := (x_1, ...x_{i-1}, z, x_{i+1}, ..., x_n)$, by the definition of $p_i^x(t)$ and some algebra we have

$$\frac{dg(p_i^x(t))}{dt} = \left(\frac{\int g(x_i) e^{tf(x)+(1-t)\widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x)} d\mu_i}{\int_{W_i} e^{tf(x)+(1-t)\widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x)} d\mu_i} \right)' = E_{\phi_t^i}(f(x_Z^{(i)}) - \widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x_Z^{(i)})) \left(g(Z) - E_{\phi_t^i} g(Z) \right), \tag{2.22}$$

where Z obeys the measure ϕ_t^i defined as

$$\frac{d\phi_t^i}{d\mu_i}(x_i) = \frac{e^{tf(x)+(1-t)\widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x)}}{\int_{W_i} e^{tf(x)+(1-t)\widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x)} d\mu_i}.$$

According to the choice of $\widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x)$, it is easy to see that for any $z \in W_i$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| f(x_z^{(i)}) - \widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x_z^{(i)}) - (f(x^{(i)}) - \widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x^{(i)})) \right| \\
= & \left| \int_0^1 \left(f_i(tx_z^{(i)} + (1-t)x^{(i)}) - d_i^x \right) (x_z^{(i)} - \theta_i) dt \right| \\
\leq & \int_0^1 \left| \left(f_i(tx_z^{(i)} + (1-t)x^{(i)}) - f_i(x) \right) (x_i - \theta_i) \right| dt + \int_0^1 \left| (f_i(x) - d_i^x)(x_i - \theta_i) \right| dt \\
\leq & c_{ii} M^2 + \| f_i(x) - d_i^x \| M. \qquad (2.23)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $E_{\phi_t^i}\left(g(Z) - E_{\phi_t^i} g(Z) \right) = 0$, and it implies that

$$E_{\phi_t^i} (f(x^{(i)}) - \widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x^{(i)})) \left(g(Z) - E_{\phi_t^i} g(Z) \right) = 0. \qquad (2.24)$$

From (1.1) and (2.21) it is clear that for each $z_1, z_2 \in W_i$ we have $|g(z_1) - g(z_2)| \leq M$, which implies that

$$E_{\phi_t^i} \left| g(Z) - E_{\phi_t^i} g(Z) \right| \leq M. \qquad (2.25)$$

Substracting $E_{\phi_t^i} (f(x^{(i)}) - \widetilde{f}^{(i)}(x^{(i)})) \left(g(Z) - E_{\phi_t^i} g(Z) \right)$ from the right hand side of (2.22), with (2.23), (2.24) and (2.25) we have

$$\left| \frac{dg(p_i^x(t))}{dt} \right| \leq c_{ii} M^3 + \| f_i(x) - d_i^x \| M^2, \qquad (2.26)$$

and consequently by (2.18), (2.19) and (2.20) we see that

$$\| \widehat{x}_i - p_i^x \| = g(\widehat{x}_i - p_i^x) = g(p_i^x(1) - p_i^x(0)) \leq c_{ii} M^3 + \| f_i(x) - d_i^x \| M^2. \qquad (2.27)$$

Therefore from (2.27) and the basic inequalities $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$, $(a^2+b^2)^{1/2} \leq a + b$, we have

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \| \widehat{x}_i - p_i^x \|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left(c_{ii} M^3 + \| f_i(x) - d_i^x \| M^2 \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{2} M^3 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_{ii}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{2} M^2 n^{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon. \qquad (2.28)$$

2.3 Sketch of the proof of the upper bound

For each $p = p(d) \in D'(\epsilon)$ we can define ν_i^p as

$$\frac{d\nu_i^p}{d\mu_i}(z) = \frac{e^{d_i(z)}}{\int_{W_i} e^{d_i(z)} d\mu_i} = e^{\lambda_{i0}(p_i) + d_i(z)} \text{ for } z \in W_i, \qquad (2.29)$$

where $\lambda_{i0}(p_i)$ satisfies that $e^{\lambda_{i0}(p_i)} = (\int_{W_i} e^{d_i(z)} d\mu_i)^{-1}$. Then from the construction of $p(d) = (p(d)_1, p(d)_2, ..., p(d)_n)$ in (2.14), it is easy to see that

$$\int_{W_i} z e^{\lambda_{i0}(p_i)+d_i(z)} d\mu_i = p_i.$$

Using the similar argument to (2.10), we can get

$$D(\nu_i^p \parallel \mu_i) = \lambda_{i0}(p_i) + d_i(p_i). \tag{2.30}$$

The idea to prove the upper bound is to consider the following approximation:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) \approx f(\widehat{x}) \approx f(p^x) &\approx f(p^x) - \sum_{i=1}^n D(\nu_i^{p^x} \parallel \mu_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n (\lambda_{i0}(p_i^x) + d_i^x(x_i)) \\ &= f(p^x) + \sum_{i=1}^n d_i^x (x_i - p_i^x). \end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

It is not hard to see that

$$\left| f(p^x) + \sum_{i=1}^n d_i^x (x_i - p_i^x) - f(x) \right| \le \mathrm{I} + \mathrm{II},$$

where

$$\mathrm{I} \ : \ = |f(\widehat{x}) - f(x)| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x^{(i)})(\widehat{x}_i - x_i) \right|, \tag{2.32}$$

$$\mathrm{II} \ : \ = |f(\widehat{x}) - f(p^x)| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^n d_i^x (\widehat{x}_i - p_i^x) \right| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \left(d_i^x - f_i(x^{(i)}) \right) (\widehat{x}_i - x_i) \right|. \tag{2.33}$$

So the proof of the above approximation consists of the bounds for I and II.

2.3.1 Bounds for I

Proposition 2. *With notations before, we have*

$$E_{\widetilde{\mu}} \left[\left(f(X) - f(\widehat{X}) \right)^2 \right] \le M^2 \left(a \sum_{i=1}^n c_{ii} + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i^2 \right) + M^4 \left(a \sum_{i,j=1}^n c_{ij}^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n b_i b_j c_{ij} \right). \tag{2.34}$$

Proof. Let

$$h(X) := f(X) - f(\widehat{X}),$$

then clearly

$$|h(X)| \le 2a. \tag{2.35}$$

From the definition of $\widehat{x}_i$ in (2.12), we have

$$\widehat{x}_j(x) = \frac{\int_W s e^{f(x_1,\ldots,x_{j-1},s,x_{j+1},\ldots,x_n)} d\mu_j(s)}{\int_W e^{f(x_1,\ldots,x_{j-1},s,x_{j+1},\ldots,x_n)} d\mu_j(s)}. \tag{2.36}$$

With (2.36) and some algebra, it is easy to verify that for $j \neq i$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d\widehat{x}_j(x)}{dx_i} = E_{\widetilde{\mu}}[X_j f_i(X) - \widehat{X}_j f_i(X) \mid X_k = x_k \text{ for } k \neq j] \\ = \;& E_{\widetilde{\mu}}[\left(X_j - \widehat{X}_j\right) f_i(X^{(j)}) \mid X_k = x_k \text{ for } k \neq j] + E_{\widetilde{\mu}}[\left(X_j - \widehat{X}_j\right)\left(f_i(X) - f_i(X^{(j)})\right) \mid X_k = x_k \text{ for } k \neq j]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.37}$$

By the definition of $\widehat{x}_j$ we have

$$E_{\widetilde{\mu}}[\left(X_j - \widehat{X}_j\right) f_i(X^{(j)}) \mid X_k = x_k \text{ for } k \neq j] = 0. \tag{2.38}$$

For the second term in (2.37), due to

$$\left\| f_i(X) - f_i(X^{(j)}) \right\| = \left\| \int_0^1 f_{ij}(tX + (1-t)X^{(j)})(X_j - \theta_j, \cdot) dt \right\| \leq c_{ij} M,$$

we have

$$\left\| E_{\widetilde{\mu}}[\left(X_j - \widehat{X}_j\right)\left(f_i(X) - f_i(X^{(j)})\right) \mid X_k = x_k \text{ for } k \neq j] \right\| \leq c_{ij} M^2. \tag{2.39}$$

Plugging (2.38) and (2.39) into (2.37), we see that for $j \neq i$

$$\left\| \frac{d\widehat{x}_j(x)}{dx_i} \right\| \leq c_{ij} M^2. \tag{2.40}$$

Obviously $\frac{d\widehat{x}_i(x)}{dx_i} = 0$. For $t \in [0,1]$ and $x \in W$, we define

$$u_i(t,x) = g_i(tx + (1-t)\widehat{x}). \tag{2.41}$$

Then it is clear that

$$h(x) = \int_0^1 \sum_{i=1}^n u_i(t,x)(x_i - \widehat{x}_i) dt. \tag{2.42}$$

With the similar arguments to the proof of Lemma 3.1 in [6] (pp. 16-17), we can verify that

$$\left| E_{\widetilde{\mu}} \left[\left(u_i(t,X) - u_i(t,X^{(i)}) \right)(X_i - \widehat{X}_i) h(X^{(i)}) \right] \right| \leq 2aM \left(tMc_{ii} + (1-t)M^3 \sum_{j=1}^n c_{ij}^2 \right), \tag{2.43}$$

and

$$\left| E_{\widetilde{\mu}} \left[u_i(t,X)(X_i - \widehat{X}_i) \left(h(X) - h(X^{(i)}) \right) \right] \right| \leq b_i M \left(Mb_i + M^3 \sum_{j=1}^n b_j c_{ij} \right). \tag{2.44}$$

With the fact that $E_{\widetilde{\mu}}\left[u_i(t,X^{(i)})(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)h(X^{(i)})\right]=0$, we have the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}&E_{\widetilde{\mu}}\left[u_i(t,X)(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)h(X)\right]\\ =\;& E_{\widetilde{\mu}}\left[\left(u_i(t,X)-u_i(t,X^{(i)})\right)(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)h(X^{(i)})\right]+E_{\widetilde{\mu}}\left[u_i(t,X)(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)\left(h(X)-h(X^{(i)})\right)\right].\end{aligned}$$

Thus by (2.42), (2.43) and (2.44), using above decomposition we have

$$\begin{aligned}E_{\widetilde{\mu}}(h^2(X)) &= \int_0^1\sum_{i=1}^n E_{\widetilde{\mu}}\left[u_i(t,X)(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)h(X)\right]dt\\ &\le M^2\left(a\sum_{i=1}^n c_{ii}+\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^2\right)+M^4\left(a\sum_{i,j=1}^n c_{ij}^2+\sum_{i,j=1}^n b_ib_jc_{ij}\right).\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 3. *If we denote*

$$G(x):=\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x^{(i)})(x_i-\widehat{x}_i),$$

then

$$E_{\widetilde{\mu}}G^2(x)\le M^2\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^2+M^3\sum_{i,j=1}^n b_i(c_{ji}+b_jc_{ji}M).$$

Proof. Taking derivative of G and with (2.40), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\frac{\partial G(x)}{\partial x_i}\right\| &= \left\|f_i(x^{(i)})\circ\left(1-\frac{\partial\widehat{x}_i}{\partial x_i}\right)+\sum_{j\neq i}^n\left(f_{ji}(x^{(j)})(\cdot,x_i-\widehat{x}_i)+f_j(x^{(j)})\circ(-\frac{\partial\widehat{x}_j}{\partial x_i})\right)\right\|\\ &\le b_i+\sum_{j\neq i}^n\left(c_{ji}M+b_jc_{ji}M^2\right)\le b_i+\sum_{j}^n\left(c_{ji}M+b_jc_{ji}M^2\right).\end{aligned}\tag{2.45}$$

Then with the same method as the proof of Lemma 3.2 in [6], we finish the proof. □

Denote

$$\begin{aligned}B_1 &:= \left(M^2\left(a\sum_{i=1}^n c_{ii}+\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^2\right)+M^4\left(a\sum_{i,j=1}^n c_{ij}^2+\sum_{i,j=1}^n b_ib_jc_{ij}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},\\ B_2 &:= \left(M^2\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^2+M^3\sum_{i,j=1}^n b_i(c_{ji}+b_jc_{ji}M)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.46}$$

And let

$$A_1 := \{x\in W,\ |f(x)-f(\widehat{x})|\le 2B_1\},$$

$$A_2 \quad := \{x \ \in W, |\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x^{(i)})(x_i - \widehat{x}_i)| \leq 2B_2\}.$$

Let $A = A_1 \cap A_2$, then with Proposition 2 and Proposition 3 it is easy to see that $P_{\widetilde{\mu}}(A) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, therefore with the fact that $2(B_1 + B_2) < B$ defined in (1.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \int_W e^{f(x_1,\ldots,x_n)} d\mu(x) &\leq \log \int_A e^{f(x_1,\ldots,x_n)} d\mu(x) + \log 2 \\ &\leq B + \log \int_A e^{f(\widehat{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x^{(i)})(x_i - \widehat{x}_i)} d\mu(x) + \log 2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.47}$$

2.3.2 Bounds for II

For $|f(\widehat{x}) - f(p^x)|$, using the expression $f(\widehat{x}) - f(p^x) = \int_0^1 \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(t\widehat{x} + (1-t)(\widehat{x} - p^x))(\widehat{x}_i - p_i^x)dt$, with (2.28) and Cauchy inequality we have

$$|f(\widehat{x}) - f(p^x)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \left\|\widehat{x}_i - p_i^x\right\| \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sqrt{2}M^3 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{ii}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{2}M^2 n^{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon\right). \tag{2.48}$$

For $\left|\sum_{i=1}^n \left(f_i(x^{(i)}) - d_i^x\right)(\widehat{x}_i - x_i)\right|$, by (1.2) and Cauchy inequality we have

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(f_i(x) - d_i^x\right)(\widehat{x}_i - x_i)\right| \leq M\sqrt{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\|f_i(x) - d_i^x\right\|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq Mn\epsilon,$$

thus by decomposing $f_i(x^{(i)}) - d_i^x$ as $f_i(x^{(i)}) - f_i(x)$ and $f_i(x) - d_i^x$ we get

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(f_i(x^{(i)}) - d_i^x\right)(\widehat{x}_i - x_i)\right| \leq \left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(f_i(x^{(i)}) - f_i(x)\right)(\widehat{x}_i - x_i)\right| + \left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(f_i(x) - d_i^x\right)(\widehat{x}_i - x_i)\right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} M^2 c_{ii} + Mn\epsilon. \tag{2.49}$$

For the last term $|\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^x(\widehat{x}_i - p_i^x)|$, noting that $\sum_{i=1}^n \left\|d_i^x\right\|^2 \leq 2\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^2 + 2\epsilon^2 n$, thus by (2.28) and Cauchy inequality we have

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^x(\widehat{x}_i - p_i^x)\right| \leq \left(2\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i^2 + 2\epsilon^2 n\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sqrt{2}M^3 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{ii}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{2}M^2 n^{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon\right). \tag{2.50}$$

Recalling the definition of II, from (2.48), (2.49) and (2.50), with the definition of D in (1.4) it is clear that

$$II \leq D. \tag{2.51}$$

2.3.3 The upper bound result

Proof. By the definition of II (2.33) it is easy to verify that

$$\left| f(\widehat{x}) - f(p^x) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x^{(i)})(x_i - \widehat{x}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^x (x_i - p_i^x) \right| \leq \text{II}.$$

Define

$$C(d) := \{x : x \in W, d^x = d\},$$

then with (2.47) and (2.51) we have

$$\log \int_W e^{f(x_1,\ldots,x_n)} d\mu(x) \leq B + \log 2 + D + \log \sum_{d \in D(\epsilon)} \int_{x \in C(d)} e^{f(p) + \sum_{i=1}^n d_i (x_i - p(d)_i)} d\mu(x), \tag{2.52}$$

where $p(d)_i$ is defined in (2.14). From (2.7) and (2.29) it is clear that

$$\int_W e^{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{i0}(p(d)_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n d_i(x_i)} d\mu(x) = 1,$$

combined with (2.30) we get the following bound

$$\int_{x \in C(d)} e^{f(p(d)) + \sum_{i=1}^n d_i (x_i - p(d)_i)} d\mu(x) \leq e^{f(p(d)) - \sum_{i=1}^n d_i (p(d)_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{i0}(p(d)_i)} = e^{f(p(d)) - \sum_{i=1}^n D(\nu_i^{p(d)} \| \mu_i)}. \tag{2.53}$$

Plugging (2.53) into (2.52) and noting the fact that for any $d \in D(\epsilon)$

$$f(p(d)) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} D(\nu_i^{p(d)} \parallel \mu_i) \leq \max_{\nu \ll \mu, \nu = \nu_1 \times \nu_2 \times \ldots \times \nu_n} \left\{ f(m(\nu_1), \ldots, m(\nu_n)) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} D(\nu_i \parallel \mu_i) \right\},$$

we finish the proof of the upper bound. □

3 Proofs of applications

In this section we give the proofs of our examples. Hereafter we always use C to denote a positive constant independent of the changing variables such as n.

3.1 Subgraph counts in the edge colored random graph

Recall the definitions in Section (1.2.1), and write $n = \binom{N}{2}$ for the toal number of edges in G. We consider the space

$$W = \{(z_1, \ldots, z_l) : \sum_{i=1}^{l} z_i = 1, z_i \geq 0, i = 1, \ldots, l\},$$

and $\widetilde{W} = W^n$. Write $\widetilde{T}(x)$ as the normalized version of $T(x)$, that is

$$\widetilde{T}(x) := T(x)/N^{k-2}.$$

Then by calculating $ET(X)$ obviously

$$T(x) \geq uET(X) \Longleftrightarrow \widetilde{T}(x) \geq tn, \text{ with } t = \frac{u}{l^{m-1}} \frac{1}{nN^{k-2}} \binom{N}{k}, \tag{3.1}$$

and $\psi_l(u) = \phi_l(t)$ where

$$\phi_l(t) := \inf\{ \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \sum_{s=1}^{l} x_{ijs} \log \frac{x_{ijs}}{1/l} : x_{ij} \in W, \widetilde{T}(x) \geq tn\}.$$

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1.1 (pp. 21) in [6], we define

$$g(x) := nKh(((\widetilde{T}(x)/n) - t)/\delta),$$

$$h(x) := \begin{cases} 10(x+1)^3 - 15(x+1)^4 + 6(x+1)^5 - 1, & -1 \leq x \leq 0 \\ 0, & \text{other wise} \end{cases}. \tag{3.2}$$

Then h is negative on $(-1, 0)$ and h has bounded second derivative. According to the definition of g we see that

$$P(\widetilde{T}(X) \geq tn) \leq \int_{\widetilde{W}} e^{g(x)} d\mu, \tag{3.3}$$

where μ is the product measure of μ_{ij}, $1 \leq i < j \leq N$. From the definition of the measure μ_{ij}, in light of Proposition 1, it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\nu \ll \mu, \nu = \nu_1 \times \nu_2 \times \ldots \times \nu_n} \left\{ g((m(\nu_{ij}))_{1 \leq i < j \leq N}) - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} D(\nu_{ij} \parallel \mu_{ij}) \right\} \\ = & \max_{y_{ij} \in W, 1 \leq i < j \leq N} \left\{ g((y_{ij})_{1 \leq i < j \leq N}) - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \sum_{k=1}^{l} y_{ijk} \log \frac{y_{ijk}}{1/l} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $K := \phi_l(t)/n$. Then same as the proof of Theorem 1.1 (pp. 21) in [6], we get

$$\max_{y_{ij} \in W, 1 \leq i < j \leq N} \left\{ g((y_{ij})_{1 \leq i < j \leq N}) - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \sum_{k=1}^{l} y_{ijk} \log \frac{y_{ijk}}{1/l} \right\} \leq -\phi_l(t - \delta).$$

Observe that if we denote $D(\epsilon)$ as the $\sqrt{n}\epsilon$-covering for $\widetilde{T}(x)$ in the sense of (1.2), then $D((\delta\epsilon)/(4K))$ is an $\sqrt{n}\epsilon$-covering for $g(x)$. Combining with Theorem 1 and (3.3), we get

$$\log P(\widetilde{T}(X) \geq tn) \leq -\phi_l(t - \delta) + B + D + \log 2 + \log |D((\delta\epsilon)/(4K))| . \tag{3.4}$$

Next we deal with the right hand side of (3.4). First we bound $\phi_l(t) - \phi_l(t-\delta)$.

3.1.1 Upper bound of $\phi_l(t) - \phi_l(t-\delta)$

In order to bound $\phi_l(t) - \phi_l(t-\delta)$, according to the definition of ϕ_l, it is enough to work with those $x = (x_{ij})_{1\le i<j\le N}$ with $x_{ij} \in W$ and $\widetilde{T}(x) = (t-\delta')\, n$ for some $0 < \delta' < \delta$. For any such x, we consider $y = (y_{ij})_{1\le i<j\le N}$, where

$$y_{ij} = (1-\epsilon)x_{ij} + \epsilon e_1,\ e_1 = (1, 0, ..., 0),$$

with $\epsilon > 0$ to be determined later. Notice that we can assume $x_{ij1} \ge x_{ij2} \ge ... \ge x_{ijl}$, since when $(\{x_{ij1}, x_{ij2}, ..., x_{ijl}\})_{1\le i<j\le N}$ is fixed, the choice $x_{ij1} \ge x_{ij2} \ge ... \ge x_{ijl}$ achieves the maximum of $\widetilde{T}(x)$ (Thus if this doesn't hold, we can consider another x' with same $\{x_{ij1}, x_{ij2}, ..., x_{ijl}\})_{1\le i<j\le N}$ but larger $\widetilde{T}(x')$). By the definition of $\widetilde{T}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & N^{k-2}(\widetilde{T}(y) - \widetilde{T}(x)) \\ = & \sum_{q\in[N]^k} \left(\prod_{\{r,r'\}\in E} \left(x_{q_r q_{r'1}} + \epsilon(\sum_{s=2}^{l} x_{q_r q_{r's}}) \right) + (1-\epsilon)^m \sum_{s=2}^{l} \prod_{\{r,r'\}\in E} x_{q_r q_{r's}} - \sum_{s=1}^{l} \prod_{\{r,r'\}\in E} x_{q_r q_{r's}} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

For each $q \in [N]^k$, by directly expanding the term

$$\prod_{\{r,r'\}\in E} \left(x_{q_r q_{r'1}} + \epsilon(\sum_{s=2}^{l} x_{q_r q_{r's}}) \right) + (1-\epsilon)^m \sum_{s=2}^{l} \prod_{\{r,r'\}\in E} x_{q_r q_{r's}},$$

with the condition that $x_{ij1} \ge x_{ij2} \ge ... \ge x_{ijl}$, we can notice that after the substraction by $\sum_{s=1}^{l} \prod_{\{r,r'\}\in E} x_{q_r q_{r's}}$, in the remain there are at least $(m-1)\epsilon^2 \sum_{\{r,r'\}\in E} \sum_{s=2}^{l} (x_{q_r q_{r's}} \prod_{E\setminus\{r,r'\}} x_{q_r q_{r'1}})$. Therefore by (3.5) we have

$$N^{k-2}(\widetilde{T}(y) - \widetilde{T}(x)) \ge (m-1)\epsilon^2 \sum_{q\in[N]^k} \left(\sum_{\{r,r'\}\in E} \frac{1 - x_{q_r q_{r'1}}}{x_{q_r q_{r'1}}} \prod_{\{r,r'\}\in E} x_{q_r q_{r'1}} \right). \tag{3.6}$$

For any $\lambda > 1/l$, we denote $N(\lambda)$ as the number of H's in G whose edges all satisfy $x_{ij1} \ge \lambda$. Note that $x_{ij1} \ge 1/l$ always holds. Denote $C(N, H)$ as the total number of different homomorphisms of H in a N vertices complete graph, then we have

$$N^{k-2}\widetilde{T}(x) \ge \sum_{q\in[N]^k} \prod_{\{r,r'\}\in E} x_{q_r q_{r'1}} \ge N(\lambda)\lambda^m + (C(N,H) - N(\lambda))\, \frac{1}{l^m},$$

which implies that

$$N(\lambda) \le \left(\left(t-\delta'\right) N^k/2 - C(N,H)/l^m\right)/(\lambda^m - 1/l^m). \tag{3.7}$$

We denote the set of H's who have at least an edge with $x_{ij1} \le \lambda$ as A. Since $x_{ij1} \le \lambda$ implies that $(1-x_{ij1})/x_{ij1} \ge (1-\lambda)/\lambda$, obviously

$$\sum_{q\in[N]^k}\left(\sum_{\{r,r'\}\in E}\frac{1-x_{q_rq_{r'1}}}{x_{q_rq_{r'1}}}\prod_{\{r,r'\}\in E}x_{q_rq_{r'1}}\right)\ge\frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda}\sum_{q\in A}\prod_{\{r,r'\}\in E}x_{q_rq_{r'1}}, \tag{3.8}$$

where in the right hand side we use $q \in A$ to represent those q with corresponding H in A for short. By the definition of $\widetilde{T}(x)$ and $N(\lambda)$, with (3.7) it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{q\in A}\prod_{\{r,r'\}\in E}x_{q_rq_{r'1}} &\ge \left(\widetilde{T}(x)N^{k-2}-N(\lambda)\right)/l\\ &\ge N^k\left[(1-1/N)\left(t-\delta'\right)/2-\left(\left(t-\delta'\right)/2-C(N,H)/(N^kl^m)\right)/(\lambda^m-1/l^m)\right]/l.\end{aligned}$$

With the fact that $C(N,H)/N^k$ converges to a positive constant as $N\to\infty$, and that t is of order $1/l^{m-1}$ by (3.1), we can choose $\lambda = 1-c/l$ for some $c>0$ such that

$$\sum_{q\in A}\prod_{\{r,r'\}\in E}x_{q_rq_{r'1}}\ge CN^kl^{-(m+1)}. \tag{3.9}$$

Combining (3.6), (3.8) and (3.9), we see that $\widetilde{T}(y)-\widetilde{T}(x)\ge C\epsilon^2N^2l^{-(m+2)}$. Thus if we choose $\epsilon = C\delta^{1/2}l^{(m+2)/2}$ for a suitable $C>0$, we have $\widetilde{T}(y)-\widetilde{T}(x)\ge\delta' n$. From the convexity of $x\log x$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_l(t) &\le \sum_{1\le i<j\le N}\sum_{s=1}^{l}y_{ijs}\log\frac{y_{ijs}}{1/l}\\ &\le (1-\epsilon)\sum_{1\le i<j\le N}\sum_{s=1}^{l}x_{ijs}\log\frac{x_{ijs}}{1/l}+\epsilon n\log l\le\phi_l(t-\delta)+CN^2\delta^{1/2}l^{(m+2)/2}\log l,\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where in the last inequality we take the inf over x.

3.1.2 Upper bound for $\phi_l(t)$

We can choose $r = C_1\left\lceil t^{1/k}N\right\rceil$, and let $x=(x_{ij})$ where

$$x_{ij}=\begin{cases}e_1, & \text{if } 1\le i<j\le r\\ (1/l,...,1/l), & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}.$$

Then it is easy to check that for a suitable $C_1>0$ we have $\widetilde{T}(x)\ge tn$ for all N. Thus

$$\phi_l(t)\le\sum_{1\le i<j\le N}\sum_{s=1}^{l}x_{ijs}\log\frac{x_{ijs}}{1/l}\le Ct^{2/k}N^2\log l. \tag{3.11}$$

3.1.3 Final calculation

We give the proofs of the upper bound and lower bound separately below.

Proof of the upper bound. Recalling that $K = \phi_l(t)/n$, with (3.11) and the fact that t is of the order $l^{-(m-1)}$, we can see that

$$K \leq Cl^{-\frac{2(m-1)}{k}} \log l.$$

We work with the L_1 norm in this problem. It is easy to verify that for $g(x)$,

$$|g(x)| \leq nK, \left\| \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_{ij}} \right\| \leq \frac{CKb'_{ij}}{\delta}, \tag{3.12}$$

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^2 g(x)}{\partial x_{ij} \partial x_{kl}} \right\| \leq \frac{CKc'_{ij,kl}}{\delta} + \frac{CKb'_{ij}b'_{kl}}{n\delta^2}, \tag{3.13}$$

where

$$b'_i \leq C,\ c'_{ij,kl} \leq \begin{cases} CN^{-1}, & \text{if } |\{i,j,k,l\}| = 2 \text{ or } 3 \\ CN^{-2}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \tag{3.14}$$

Denoting the $\sqrt{n}\epsilon$-covering set in Theorem 1.2 of [6] as $\widetilde{D}(\epsilon)$. Since we are working with L_1 norm and each x_{ij} is l dimensional, it is not hard to observe that for any $\epsilon' > 0$, $D(\epsilon') := \widetilde{D}(\epsilon'/\sqrt{l}) \times ... \times \widetilde{D}(\epsilon'/\sqrt{l})$ (the product of l elements) is an $\sqrt{n}\epsilon'$-covering of $\widetilde{T}(x)$ in the sense of (1.2). Therefore with Lemma 5.2 in [6] it is easy to get

$$\log |D((\delta\epsilon)/(4K))| \leq C \frac{l^3 N K^4}{\delta^4 \epsilon^4} (\log N). \tag{3.15}$$

Now we bound the right hand side of (3.4). It is clear that in this example $M \leq 2$. With (3.12), (3.13) and (3.14), by some algebra it is easy to see that under the conditions

$$N\delta^2 > 1, k/\delta > 1, N\delta\epsilon/K > 1, \epsilon < 1, \tag{3.16}$$

we have

$$B = CN^{\frac{3}{2}} K^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{-1}, D = CN^2 \epsilon K \delta^{-1}. \tag{3.17}$$

Thus with (3.4), (3.10), (3.15) and (3.17), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \log P(\widetilde{T}(X) \geq tn) \quad \leq \quad & -\phi_l(t) + \log 2 + CN^2 \delta^{1/2} l^{(m+2)/2} \log l + CN^{\frac{3}{2}} K^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{-1} \\ & + CN^2 \epsilon K \delta^{-1} + C \frac{l^3 N K^4}{\delta^4 \epsilon^4} (\log N). \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Denote T_i as the number of H's in G whose edges are all of color i, and let $\widetilde{T}_i = T_i / N^{k-2}$. Then obviously T_i has the same distribution as the number of triangles in $G(N, l^{-1})$, thus by Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.5 in [14] we have

$$-\log P(\widetilde{T}_i \geq tl^{-1}n) \geq CN^2 l^{-\Delta}. \tag{3.19}$$

With the fact $P(\widetilde{T} \geq tn) = P(\sum_{i=1}^{l} \widetilde{T}_i \geq tn) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{l} P(\widetilde{T}_i \geq tl^{-1}n)$, from (3.19) we further get

$$-\log P(\widetilde{T} \geq tn) \geq -\log l P(\widetilde{T}_i \geq tl^{-1}n) \geq CN^2 l^{-\Delta} - \log l. \tag{3.20}$$

Choosing $\epsilon = N^{-1/5}\delta^{-3/5}K^{3/5}l^{3/5}(\log N)^{1/5}$, $\delta = N^{-(2\Delta+m+2)/(19+8m+21\Delta)}(\log N)^{-4}$, with (3.19) and (3.20) it is directly to derive that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\phi_l(t)}{-\log P(\widetilde{T} \geq tn)} \quad \leq \quad & 1 + CN^{-\frac{m/2+\Delta+1}{19+8m+21\Delta}} l^{m/2+\Delta+1}(\log l)(\log N)^{-2} + CN^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{m+2\Delta+2}{19+8m+21\Delta}} l^{-\frac{3(m-1)}{k}+\Delta}(\log l)^{3/2}(\log N)^4 \\ & + CN^{-\frac{1}{5}+\frac{8}{5}\frac{m+2\Delta+2}{19+8m+21\Delta}} l^{\frac{3}{5}-\frac{16(m-1)}{5k}+\Delta}(\log l)^{\frac{8}{5}}(\log N)^{\frac{33}{5}} + o(1).\end{aligned}$$

With above equation and the fact that $(m-1)/k < \Delta/2$, we can check that if $l \leq N^{1/(19+8m+21\Delta)}$ then the right hand side goes to 0 as $N \to \infty$, and it is directly to verify that condition (3.16) holds. Recalling that $\psi_l(u) = \phi_l(t)$, we finish the proof. □

Proof of the lower bound. Fix any $z \in \widetilde{W}$ such that

$$\widetilde{T}(z) \geq (t + \delta_0)n,$$

with δ_0 to be determined later. Denote e_j as the l-dimension vector with 1 on the jth coordinate and 0 on others. Let Z_i, $1 \leq i \leq n$ be independent random vectors with $P(Z_i = e_j) = z_{ij}$, and call the measure of $Z = (Z_1, .., Z_n)$ as $\widehat{\mu}$. Let A be the set of $x \in \widetilde{W}$ such that $\widetilde{T}(x) \geq tn$, and A' be the subset of A where

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{l} \left(x_{ik} \log z_{ik} - x_{ik} \log \frac{1}{l} - z_{ik} \log (l z_{ik}) \right) \right| \leq \epsilon_0 n.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\widetilde{T}(X) \geq tn) = \int_A 1 d\mu \quad & \geq \quad \int_{A'} e^{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{l} (-x_{ik} \log z_{ik} + x_{ik} \log z_{ik})} d\mu \\ & \geq \quad e^{z_{ik} \log(l z_{ik}) - \epsilon_0 n} P_{\widehat{\mu}}(Z \in A'). \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Denote

$$H(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{l} \left(x_{ik} \log (l z_{ik}) - z_{ik} \log (l z_{ik}) \right),$$

then obviously $E_{\widehat{\mu}} H(Z) = 0$. By direct calculation we have

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\widehat{\mu}}(H(Z)) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{l} z_{ik} \log (z_{ik}) - \left(\sum_{k=1}^{l} z_{ik} \log (z_{ik}) \right)^2 \right]. \tag{3.22}$$

Noting that

$$\log \left(\frac{1}{l} \right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{l} z_{ik} \log (z_{ik}) \leq 0,$$

with (3.22) it is clear that

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\widehat{\mu}}(H(Z)) \leq Cn\left(\log l\right)^2,$$

thus by choosing $\epsilon_0 = CN^{-1}\left(\log l\right)$ for a suitable $C > 0$ we have

$$P_{\widehat{\mu}}(|H(Z)| > \epsilon_0 n) \leq \frac{C\left(\log l\right)^2}{\epsilon_0^2 n} = \frac{1}{4}. \tag{3.23}$$

Let $S(x) := \widetilde{T}(x) - \widetilde{T}(z)$. By the similar method to (4.3) - (4.4) in [6] we can verify that

$$E_{\widehat{\mu}}(S^2) \leq CN^2.$$

Thus by choosing $\delta_0 = CN^{-1}$ for a suitable $C > 0$ we get

$$P_{\widehat{\mu}}(\widetilde{T}(Z) \leq tn) \leq \frac{CN^2}{\delta_0^2 n^2} = \frac{1}{4}. \tag{3.24}$$

With (3.23) and (3.24) we see that $P_{\widehat{\mu}}(Z \in A') \geq 1/2$, therefore with (3.21) and by taking the sup over z we get

$$\begin{aligned}\log P(\widetilde{T}(X) \geq tn) &\geq -\phi_l(t+\delta_0) - \epsilon_0 n - \log 2 \\ &\geq -\phi_l(t) - CN^2\delta_0^{1/2} l^{(m+2)/2}\log l - CN\left(\log l\right) - \log 2,\end{aligned}$$

consequently with (3.20) we see that

$$\frac{-\phi_l(t)}{-\log P(\widetilde{T}(X) \geq tn)} \geq 1 - CN^{-\frac{1}{2}} l^{\Delta + \frac{m+2}{2}} \log N + o(1),$$

which completes the proof. □

3.2 Weighted triangle counts in continuous case

We follow the routine of the above example. Define the normalized weighted triangle counts $\widetilde{T}(x)$ as

$$\widetilde{T}(x) := T(x)/N.$$

Let $t = u \cdot (N-2)/(24N)$, then it is easy to see that $\{T(x) \geq uET(X)\} = \{\widetilde{T}(x) \geq tn\}$. Define

$$\phi_n(t) := \inf\{\sum_{i<j}(-1 + \frac{\lambda_{y_{ij}} e^{-\lambda_{y_{ij}}}}{1 - e^{-\lambda_{y_{ij}}}} + \log(\frac{\lambda_{y_{ij}}}{1 - e^{-\lambda_{y_{ij}}}})) : y_{ij} = y_{ji} \in (0,1) \text{ such that } \widetilde{T}(y) \geq tn\},$$

then obviously $\phi_n(t) = \psi_n(u)$. Choose $g(x) := nKh(((\widetilde{T}(x)/n) - t)/\delta)$ with h defined in (3.2), and let $K = \phi_n(t)/n$. Then same as the proof of Theorem 1.1 (pp. 21) in [6], we get

$$\max_{(y_{ij})_{i<j}} \left\{ g(y) - \sum_{i<j} D(\nu^{y_{ij}} \parallel \mu_{ij}) \right\} \leq -\phi_n(t-\delta).$$

Applying Theorem 1, we get

$$\log P(\widetilde{T}(X) \geq tn) \leq \log E e^{g(x)} \leq -\phi_n(t-\delta) + B + \log 2 + D + \log |D(\epsilon)|\,. \tag{3.25}$$

In order to deal with the rightmost side of (3.25), we first bound $\phi_n(t) - \phi_n(t-\delta)$ and K.

3.2.1 The upper bound for $\phi_n(t) - \phi_n(t-\delta)$

First, it is easy to verify that if we denote $f_1(\lambda^a) = E_{\nu^a} X$, then

$$f_1(x) = \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{e^x - 1},$$

and

$$\text{on any bounded interval } [-M, M], \text{ there exists } c_M > 0 \text{ s.t. } f_1'(x) < -c_M. \tag{3.26}$$

We denote $f_2(\lambda^a) = D(\nu^a || U)$, then

$$f_2(x) = -1 + \frac{xe^{-x}}{1 - e^{-x}} + \log(\frac{x}{1 - e^{-x}}),$$

and it is easy to see that

$$f_2'(x) < 0 \text{ when } x < 0;\ f_2'(x) > 0 \text{ when } x > 0;\ \left|f_2'(x)\right| \leq C_D \text{ for some } C_D < \infty. \tag{3.27}$$

We assume that $t - \delta > 1/24$, because in the end we will choose $\delta \to 0$ as $n \to 0$. In order to bound $\phi_n(t) - \phi_n(t-\delta)$, it is enough to consider those $z = (z_{ij})_{1 \leq i < j \leq N}$ such that $\widetilde{T}(z) = (t - \delta')\, n$ for some $\delta' \in [0, \delta]$. For any such z, we can assume that $z_{ij} \geq 1/2$, otherwise according to (3.27) we can change those $z_{ij} < 1/2$ to $1/2$ without increase in $\sum_{i<j} D(\nu^{z_{ij}} || U)$. For a $s \in (1/2, 1)$ to be determined later, we denote $A(s) := \{z_{ij} : z_{ij} \geq s\}$ and $V_s(i) := \{z_{ik} : z_{ik} \geq s\}$. Write $B(s)$ as the set of triangles whose three edges all belong to $A(s)$. Observing that for each edge $\{i, j\} \in A(s)$, the number of triangles in $B(s)$ containing $\{i, j\}$ is at least $V_s(i) + V_s(j) - N - 1$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} |B(s)| &\geq \frac{1}{3} \sum_{\{i,j\} \in A(s)} (V_s(i) + V_s(j) - N - 1) \\ &= \frac{1}{3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} (V_s(i))^2 - |A(s)|\,(N-1) \right) \geq \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{4\,|A(s)|^2}{N} - |A(s)|\,(N-1) \right), \end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

where the second equality is by the fact that each $V_s(i)$ appears $V_s(i)$ times in the summation, and the last inequality is by the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^{N} |V_s(i)| = 2\,|A(s)|$ and Cauchy inequality. Since

$$\binom{N}{3} \geq T(z) \geq |B(s)|\,(s^3 - 1/8) + ET(X), \tag{3.29}$$

with the fact that $ET(X) = N^3/48 + o(N^2)$, substituting (3.28) into (3.29) it is easy to see that there exist $s, c_s > 0$ independent of N such that $|A(s)| \leq (1 - c_s)n$. We find $c_s n$ number of edges in $A(s)^C$. We increase the weights on them by $\epsilon > 0$ and get a new weight vector $\widetilde{z} = (\widetilde{z}_{ij})_{1 \leq i < j \leq N}$, where ϵ will be determined later also. Later we can verify that $\epsilon \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, thus the weight-increasing operation is available as N is large enough. Since for each edge there are $N - 2$ triangles containing it, after the operation, each edge in $A(s)^C$ at least contribute $\epsilon/5$ more to $\widetilde{T}(z)$. Therefore we get

$$\widetilde{T}(\widetilde{z}) - \widetilde{T}(z) \geq \frac{c_s n \epsilon}{5},$$

which implies that we just need to choose $\epsilon = c_s' \delta'$ for some $c_s' > 0$ to make $\widetilde{T}(\widetilde{z}) \geq tn$. Since for N large enough we can find $s_1 < 1$ such that $s + \epsilon < s_1$, with (3.26), we see that for those $z_{ij} \in A(s)^C$, we have $\left|\lambda^{z_{ij}} - \lambda^{\widetilde{z}_{ij}}\right| \leq c_{s_1}\epsilon$ for some $c_{s_1} > 0$, and thus with (3.27) we have $D(\nu^{\widetilde{z}_{ij}}||U) - D(\nu^{z_{ij}}||U) \leq C_D c_{s_1}\epsilon$, which implies that

$$\sum_{i<j} D(\nu^{\widetilde{z}_{ij}} \parallel \mu_{ij}) - \sum_{i<j} D(\nu^{z_{ij}} \parallel \mu_{ij}) \leq C_D c_{s_1} \epsilon n \leq C_D c_{s_1} c_s' \delta' n.$$

Recalling that $\delta' \leq \delta$ and taking the inf over $(z_{ij})_{1 \leq i < j \leq N}$, we see that there exists $C_t > 0$ such that

$$\phi_n(t) - \phi_n(t - \delta) \leq C_t N^2 \delta. \tag{3.30}$$

3.2.2 Bound for K

In order to bound K, we just need to bound $\phi_n(t)$. Obviously we can choose $z_{ij} = s_t$ such that $\widetilde{T}(z) \geq tn$ for all n, thus $\phi_n(t) \leq C_t' N^2$ for some $C_t' < \infty$, which implies that $K \leq C_t'$ since $K = \phi_n(t)/n$.

3.3 Final calculation

We give the proofs of the upper bound and lower bound separately below.

Proof of the upper bound. With our choice of g, it is easy to verify that

$$B = CN^{3/2}\delta^{-1} + CN\delta^{-2},\ D = CN\delta^{-2} + N^2\delta^{-1}\epsilon. \tag{3.31}$$

Since in the sense of (1.2), the $\sqrt{n}\delta\epsilon/(4K)$-covering of $\widetilde{T}(x)$ is an $\sqrt{n}\epsilon$-covering of $g(x)$, by Lemma 5.2 in [6] we have that for $g(x)$, $\log|D(\epsilon)| \leq CN\delta^{-4}\epsilon^{-4}\log N$. Choosing $\epsilon = N^{-1/5}\delta^{2/5}$, by (3.25),

(3.30) and (3.31) we get

$$\log P(\widetilde{T}(X) \geq tn) \leq -\phi_n(t) + CN^2\delta + C\frac{N^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\delta} + C\frac{N}{\delta^2} + CN^{\frac{9}{5}}\delta^{-\frac{8}{5}}(\log N)^{\frac{1}{5}}. \tag{3.32}$$

For any $s < 1$, based on the graph G and weight X we construct a graph $G'_s(X)$ in the following way: making those edges with weight $> s$ as connected and other edges as unconnected. Write $T_s(X)$ as the number of triangles in $G'_s(X)$. Then it is not hard to see that we can choose $0 < s_u < 1$ and $1 < u' < 8$ such that

$$\{T(X) \geq uET(X)\} \subset \{T_{s_u}(X) \geq u'ET_{s_u}(X)\}.$$

Since G' is just $G(N, 1 - s_u)$, with Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.5 in [14] we see that

$$-\log P(\widetilde{T}(X) \geq tn) \geq -\log P(T_{s_u}(X) \geq u'ET_{s_u}(X)) \geq CN^2. \tag{3.33}$$

Choosing $\delta = N^{-1/10}$ and dividing $-\log P(\widetilde{T}(X) \geq tn)$ in both sides of (3.32), we get the desired upper bound. □

Proof of the lower bound. Fix any $z = (z_{ij})_{1\leq i<j\leq N}$ with $z_{ij} \in (0, 1)$ and $\widetilde{T}(z) \geq (t + \delta_0)n$ with δ_0 to be determined later, we consider $Y = (Y_{ij})_{1\leq i<j\leq N}$ with Y_{ij} $(i < j)$ independently obey $\nu^{z_{ij}}$. Call the distribution of Y as $\widehat{\mu}$. Denote

$$A := \{x = (x_{ij})_{1\leq i<j\leq N} : x_{ij} = x_{ji} \in (0, 1)^n, \widetilde{T}(x) \geq tn\},$$

and

$$A' := A \cap \{x = (x_{ij})_{1\leq i<j\leq N} : \ |\sum_{i<j}(-\lambda_{z_{ij}}x_{ij} - (-1 + \frac{\lambda_{z_{ij}}e^{-\lambda_{z_{ij}}}}{1 - e^{-\lambda_{z_{ij}}}}))| < \epsilon_0 n\},$$

for ϵ_0 to be determined later. Noting that $P(\widetilde{T}(X) \geq tn) = E1_A$ and $A' \subset A$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\widetilde{T}(X) \geq tn) &\geq E1_{A'}e^{\sum_{i<j}(-\lambda_{z_{ij}}x_{ij} + \log(\frac{\lambda_{z_{ij}}}{1-e^{-\lambda_{z_{ij}}}})) - \sum_{i<j}(-\lambda_{z_{ij}}x_{ij} + \log(\frac{\lambda_{z_{ij}}}{1-e^{-\lambda_{z_{ij}}}}))} \\ &\geq e^{-\sum_{i<j} D(\nu^{z_{ij}}||U) - \epsilon_0 n}P_{\widehat{\mu}}(Y \in A'). \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

By direct integration, we can see that $\mathrm{E}_{\widehat{\mu}}[(\sum_{i<j}(-\lambda_{z_{ij}}Y_{ij} - (-1 + \frac{\lambda_{z_{ij}}e^{-\lambda_{z_{ij}}}}{1-e^{-\lambda_{z_{ij}}}})))^2] \leq Cn$ for some $C > 0$. Thus by choosing $\epsilon_0 = (4C/n)^{1/2}$ we get

$$P_{\widehat{\mu}}(\sum_{i<j}(-\lambda_{z_{ij}}Y_{ij} - (-1 + \frac{\lambda_{z_{ij}}e^{-\lambda_{z_{ij}}}}{1 - e^{-\lambda_{z_{ij}}}})) \geq \epsilon_0 n) \leq \frac{C}{\epsilon_0^2 n} = \frac{1}{4}.$$

With the similar method to (4.4) in [6], by choosing $\delta_0 = CN^{-1}$, we have that $P_{\widehat{\mu}}(\widetilde{T}(Y) \leq tn) \leq 1/4$.

Thus $P_{\widehat{\mu}}(Y \in A') \geq 1/2$, and with (3.34) by taking sup over z we get

$$\log P(\widetilde{T}(X) \geq tn) \geq -\phi_n(t + \delta_0) - \epsilon_0 n - \log 2,$$

Combining with (3.30) we get

$$\log P(\widetilde{T}(X) \geq tn) \geq -\phi_n(t) + CN - \log 2,$$

which implies the lower bound part with (3.33). □

3.4 An extension of Basak and Mukherjee [2]

Here we prove Theorem 4. For convenience we write

$$f(x) := H_n^{J,h}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} A_{n(i,j)} x_i^T J x_j + \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^T h,$$

and

$$\widetilde{f}(x) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} A_{n(i,j)} x_i^T J x_j.$$

W.L.O.G. we assume that μ_i's are defined in the unit ball in R^N. With the similar argument to Lemma 3.1 in [2], we can further assume that

$$\max_{i,j} \left| A_{n(i,j)} \right| = o(1) \text{ and } A_{n(i,i)} = 0 \text{ for all } i. \tag{3.35}$$

We work with the L_1 norm, and note that

$$\sup_{x \in B_{R^N}(1)} \|x\|_{L_1} = \sqrt{N}.$$

By the definition of f and (1.7) it is direct to verify that

$$a = O(n),\ b_i = O(\sum_j \left| A_{n(i,j)} \right|) + O(1),\ c_{ij} = O(\left| A_{n(i,j)} \right|). \tag{3.36}$$

With (3.36) and Theorem 1 it is straightforward to verify that the lower bound part is implied, that is,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \left[\int_{W^n} e^{H_n^{J,h}(x_1,\ldots,x_n)} d\mu(x) - \max_{\nu \ll \mu, \nu = \nu_1 \times \nu_2 \times \ldots \times \nu_n,} \left\{ H_n^{J,h}(m(\nu_1), \ldots, m(\nu_n)) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} D(\nu_i \parallel \mu_i) \right\} \right] \geq 0.$$

Next we consider the upper bound part. If we calculate B and D in Theorem 1, then they are of the wrong order. In order to show Theorem 4, we incorporate the special property f into the proof

of Theorem 1. For f and $\widetilde{f}$ we have

$$f_i(x)(z) = \sum_{j\neq i} A_{n(j,i)} x_j^T J z + h^T z,\ \widetilde{f}_i(x)(z) = \sum_{j\neq i} A_{n(j,i)} x_j^T J z.$$

Defining $\widetilde{\mu}$ same as (2.11), we claim that

$$E_{\widetilde{\mu}}\left[\left(\widetilde{f}(X) - \widetilde{f}(\widehat{X})\right)^2\right] = o(n^2), \tag{3.37}$$

$$E_{\widetilde{\mu}}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{f}_i(X)(X_i - \widehat{X}_i)\right)^2\right] = o(n^2). \tag{3.38}$$

We defer their proofs to later place. By (3.37) and (3.38) we see that there exists $\sigma_n \to 0$ such that $P_{\widetilde{\mu}}(\Omega_n) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, where

$$\Omega_n := \{x \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu), \left|\widetilde{f}(x) - \widetilde{f}(\widehat{x})\right|, \left|\sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{f}_i(x)(x_i - \widehat{x}_i)\right| \leq \sigma_n n\}.$$

By Lemma 3.4 in [2] it is not hard to see that $(\log |D(\epsilon)|)/n \to 0$. For each $d \in D(\epsilon)$, we consider

$$E_d := \{x \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu) : \sum_{i=1}^n \|f_i(x) - d_i\|^2 \leq n\epsilon^2\} \cap \Omega_n.$$

If it is not empty, we pick one element $z_d \in E_d$. Consider

$$\widetilde{D}(\epsilon) := \{z_d : d \in D(\epsilon),\ E_d \neq \varnothing\}.$$

Then for any $x \in \Omega_n$, by triangle inequality we can find $y_x := z_{d^x} \in \widetilde{D}(\epsilon)$, such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|f_i(x) - f_i(y_x)\|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|f_i(x) - d_i^x\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \|d_i^x - f_i(y_{d^x})\|^2 \leq 2n\epsilon^2. \tag{3.39}$$

By the construction of $\widetilde{D}(\epsilon)$ obviously $|\widetilde{D}(\epsilon)| \leq |D(\epsilon)|$, thus

$$\left(\log\left|\widetilde{D}(\epsilon)\right|\right) = o(n). \tag{3.40}$$

Now we do the following approximation for $x \in \Omega_n$:

$$f(x) \approx f(\widehat{y_x}) - \sum_{i=1}^n D(\nu_i^{\widehat{y_x}} \parallel \mu_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{d\nu_i^{\widehat{y_x}}}{d\mu_i}(x_i).$$

More precisely, we want to show that

$$\left| f(x) - \left(f(\widehat{y_x}) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} D(\widehat{\nu_i^{y_x}} \parallel \mu_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \frac{d\widehat{\nu_i^{y_x}}}{d\mu_i}(x_i) \right) \right| = o(n). \tag{3.41}$$

If (3.41) holds, then by (3.40) and the same method as section 2.3.3, it is not hard to see that the proof is completed.

Now we show (3.41). Notice that by the form of f we have

$$(\widehat{y_x})_i = \frac{E_{\mu_i} x_i e^{\sum_{j\neq i} A_{n(i,j)} x_i^T J (y_x)_j + x_i^T h}}{E_{\mu_i} e^{\sum_{j\neq i} A_{n(i,j)} x_i^T J (y_x)_j + x_i^T h}} = \frac{E_{\mu} x_i e^{f_i(y_x)(x_i)}}{E_{\mu} e^{f_i(y_x)(x_i)}}.$$

Comparing with (2.7) in Proposition 1, by (2.9) and (2.10) we see that for any $z \in R^d$

$$\log \frac{d\widehat{\nu_i^{y_x}}}{d\mu_i}(z) - D(\widehat{\nu_i^{y_x}} \parallel \mu_i) = f_i(y_x)(z - (\widehat{y_x})_i).$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| f(x) - \left(f(\widehat{y_x}) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} D(\widehat{\nu_i^{y_x}} \parallel \mu_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \frac{d\widehat{\nu_i^{y_x}}}{d\mu_i}(x_i) \right) \right| \\ \leq & \left| \widetilde{f}(x) - \widetilde{f}(y_x) \right| + \left| \widetilde{f}(y_x) - \widetilde{f}(\widehat{y_x}) \right| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \widetilde{f}_i(y_x)(x_i - (y_x)_i) \right| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \widetilde{f}_i(y_x)((y_x)_i - (\widehat{y_x})_i) \right|, \end{aligned} \tag{3.42}$$

where in the last inequality we replace f by $\widetilde{f}$ since it is easy to check that all the terms involving h cancel in the first line. Recalling that $y_x \in \Omega_n$, by the definition of Ω_n we see that

$$\left| \widetilde{f}(y_x) - \widetilde{f}(\widehat{y_x}) \right| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \widetilde{f}_i(y_x)((y_x)_i - (\widehat{y_x})_i) \right| = o(n). \tag{3.43}$$

Thus it remains to bound $\left| \widetilde{f}(x) - \widetilde{f}(y_x) \right|$ and $\left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \widetilde{f}_i(y_x)(x_i - (y_x)_i) \right|$. For $\left| \widetilde{f}(x) - \widetilde{f}(y_x) \right|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \widetilde{f}(x) - \widetilde{f}(y_x) \right| &= \left| \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} A_{n(i,j)} \left(x_i^T J \left(x_j - (y_x)_j \right) + \left(x_i^T - (y_x)_i^T \right) J (y_x)_j \right) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i} \left(\widetilde{f}_i(x) - \widetilde{f}_i(y_x) \right)(x_i) \right| + \left| \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j} \left(\widetilde{f}_j(x) - \widetilde{f}_j(y_x) \right)(y_x) \right| \\ &\leq \sqrt{N}\sqrt{n} \left(\sum_{i} \left\| \widetilde{f}_i(x) - \widetilde{f}_i(y_x) \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{2N} n \epsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{3.44}$$

where the last inequality is from (3.39). For $\left|\sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{f}_i(y_x)(x_i-(y_x)_i)\right|$, note that

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{f}_i(y_x)(x_i-(y_x)_i)\right| = \left|\sum_{i,j=1}^n A_{n(i,j)}\left(x_i^T-(y_x)_i^T\right)J(y_x)_j\right| = \left|\sum_j \left(\widetilde{f}_j(x)-\widetilde{f}_j(y_x)\right)(y_x)\right|,$$

which we already bound in (3.44). Thus combining (3.42), (3.43) and (3.44), we get (3.41).

In the following we prove (3.37) and (3.38). We need the following two inequalities. By (1.7) and (3.36), we see that there exists $C>0$ (since W is compact) such that for any $w_1,w_2,...,w_n\in W^n$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left\|\widetilde{f}_i(w_i)\right\|^2 \le C(n+\sum_{i=1}^n(\sum_{j=1}^n |A_{n(i,j)}|)^2) \le C(n+n\sum_{i,j=1}^n |A_{n(i,j)}|^2) \le C(n+ntr\left(A_n^2\right)) = o(n^2), \tag{3.45}$$

and by (1.7) again we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left\|\widetilde{f}_i(x)\right\| \le \sum_{i=1}^n \left\|\sum_{j\neq i} A_{n(i,j)}Jx_j\right\|_\infty \le \sqrt{N}\left\|J\right\|_\infty \sup_{x\in[0,1]^n}\sum_{i\in[n]}\left|\sum_{j\in[n]}A_n(i,j)x_j\right| = O(n). \tag{3.46}$$

Proof of (3.37). If we directly apply Proposition 2 for $\widetilde{f}$, then we can see that only $\sum_{i,j=1}^n b_ib_jc_{ij}$ is of wrong order, which comes from (2.44). Here we bound $\sum_{i=1}^n E_{\widetilde{\mu}}\left[u_i(t,X)(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)\left(h(X)-h(X^{(i)})\right)\right]$ in a different way to fix the order. Recall that

$$h(x)=\widetilde{f}(x)-\widetilde{f}(\widehat{x}),\ u_i(t,x)=\widetilde{f}_i(tx+(1-t)\widehat{x}).$$

By arrangement we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(X)-h(X^{(i)}) &= \widetilde{f}(X)-\widetilde{f}(X^{(i)})+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{l,j}A_{n(l,j)}(\widehat{X}_l)^TJ\left(\widehat{X}_j-\widehat{X^{(i)}}_j\right)+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{l,j}A_{n(l,j)}(\widehat{X}_l-\widehat{X^{(i)}}_l)^TJ\widehat{X^{(i)}}_j \\ &= \widetilde{f}(X)-\widetilde{f}(X^{(i)})+\frac{1}{2}\sum_j\widetilde{f}_j(\widehat{X})\left(\widehat{X}_j-\widehat{X^{(i)}}_j\right)+\frac{1}{2}\sum_l\widetilde{f}_l(\widehat{X^{(i)}})\left(\widehat{X}_l-\widehat{X^{(i)}}_l\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.47}$$

Let $\theta=(0,0,...,0)$ in R^N. We have

$$\widetilde{f}(X)-\widetilde{f}(X^{(i)})=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{l,j}A_{n(l,j)}(X_l)^TJX_j-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{l,j}A_{n(l,j)}(X_l^{(i)})^TJX_j^{(i)}=\sum_{j\neq i}A_{n(i,j)}(X_i)^TJX_j=\widetilde{f}_i(X)(X_i). \tag{3.48}$$

By Cauchy inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\sum_{i=1}^n E\left[\left(\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(X)\right\|+\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(\widehat{X})\right\|\right)\left(\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(X)\right\|\right)\right]\right| \\ \le\ &\left(\sum_{i=1}^n\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(X)\right\|^2\right)^{1/2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(X)\right\|^2\right)^{1/2}+\left(\sum_{i=1}^n\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(\widehat{X})\right\|^2\right)^{1/2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(X)\right\|^2\right)^{1/2}=o(n^2), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line is by (3.45). Thus with (3.48) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} E\left[u_i(t,X)(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)\left(\widetilde{f}(X)-\widetilde{f}(X^{(i)})\right)\right]\right| \\ = & \left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} E\left[\left(t\widetilde{f}_i(X)+(1-t)\widetilde{f}_i(\widehat{X})\right)(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)\left(\widetilde{f}_i(X)(X_i)\right)\right]\right| \\ \leq & N\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} E\left[\left(\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(X)\right\|+\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(\widehat{X})\right\|\right)\left(\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(X)\right\|\right)\right]\right| = o(n^2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.49}$$

Next, we denote $\Delta_{j,i} := \widehat{X}_j - \widehat{X^{(i)}}_j$, then by (2.40), (3.35) and (3.36) we see that

$$\max_{i,j}|\Delta_{j,i}| \leq \sqrt{N}\max_{i,j}\left|A_{n(i,j)}\right| = o(1). \tag{3.50}$$

Note that by (3.46)

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\left\|\widetilde{f}_j(\widehat{X})\right\|\left(\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(X)\right\|+\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(\widehat{X})\right\|\right) \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|\widetilde{f}_j(\widehat{X})\right\|\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(X)\right\|+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(\widehat{X})\right\|\right) = O(n^2). \tag{3.51}$$

Noting that $|\widetilde{f}_j(\widehat{X})(\Delta_{j,i}^T)(u_i(t,X)(X_i-\widehat{X}_i))| \leq ||\widetilde{f}_j(\widehat{X})||(||\widetilde{f}_i(X)|| + ||\widetilde{f}_i(\widehat{X})||)$, with (3.50) and (3.51) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} E\left[u_i(t,X)(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_j \widetilde{f}_j(\widehat{X})\left(\widehat{X}_j-\widehat{X^{(i)}}_j\right)\right)\right]\right| \\ = & \left|\frac{1}{2}E\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\widetilde{f}_j(\widehat{X})\left(\Delta_{j,i}^T\right)\left(u_i(t,X)(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)\right)\right| = o(n^2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.52}$$

Similarly we can show that

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} E\left[u_i(t,X)(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_l \widetilde{f}_j(\widehat{X^{(i)}})\left(\widehat{X}_l-\widehat{X^{(i)}}_l\right)\right)\right]\right| = o(n^2), \tag{3.53}$$

thus with (3.49), (3.52), (3.53) and (3.47), we fix the bound to be $o(n^2)$ and finish the proof. □

Proof of (3.38). Denote

$$G(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{n}\widetilde{f}_i(x)(x_i-\widehat{x}_i).$$

Then by the definition of $\widehat{X}_i$ we have

$$E_{\widetilde{\mu}}\left[G(X^{(i)})\widetilde{f}_i(X^{(i)})(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)\right] = 0.$$

Note that $\widetilde{f}_i(X^{(i)}) = \widetilde{f}_i(X)$, thus it is enough to show that

$$E_{\widetilde{\mu}}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}\widetilde{f}_i(X^{(i)})(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)\left(G(X)-G(X^{(i)})\right)\right]=o(n^2). \tag{3.54}$$

With some algebra we have

$$\begin{aligned} G(X)-G(X^{(i)}) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{l=1}^{n}A_{n(l,j)}\left(X_l^T J(X_j-\widehat{X}_j)-\left(X_l^{(i)}\right)^T J(X_j^{(i)}-\widehat{X^{(i)}}_j)\right) \\ &= \sum_{j\neq i}^{n}\widetilde{f}_j(X)\left(\widehat{X^{(i)}}_j-\widehat{X}_j\right)+\left(2\widetilde{f}_i(X)-\widetilde{f}_i(\widehat{X^{(i)}})\right)(X_i). \end{aligned} \tag{3.55}$$

With previous definition of $\Delta_{j,i}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{\widetilde{\mu}}\left[\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\widetilde{f}_i(X^{(i)})(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)\left(\sum_{j\neq i}^{n}\widetilde{f}_j(X)\left(\widehat{X}_j-\widehat{X^{(i)}}_j\right)\right)\right|\right] \\ \leq\ & \max_{i,j}\|\Delta_{j,i}\|\cdot\sqrt{N}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(X^{(i)})\right\|\right)\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\|\widetilde{f}_j(X)\right\|\right)=o(n^2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.56}$$

Also we have

$$E_{\widetilde{\mu}}\left[\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\widetilde{f}_i(X^{(i)})(X_i-\widehat{X}_i)\left(\left(2\widetilde{f}_i(X)-\widetilde{f}_i(\widehat{X^{(i)}})\right)(X_i)\right)\right|\right]\leq N\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(X^{(i)})\right\|\left(2\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(X)\right\|+\left\|\widetilde{f}_i(\widehat{X})\right\|\right)=o(n^2), \tag{3.57}$$

where the last line is by Cauchy inequality and (3.45). With (3.54), (3.55), (3.56) and (3.57), we finish the proof. □

Acknowledgements. The author would thank Sourav Chatterjee for proposing this research direction. The author would also thank Sourav Chatterjee, Amir Dembo, Sumit Mukherjee and Yufei Zhao for helpful discussions.

References

[1] A. Abouelaoualim, K. Ch. Das, L. Faria, Y. Manoussakis, C. Martinhon, and R. Saad. Paths and trails in edge-colored graphs. *Theoretical Computer Sciences*, 2008.

[2] Anirban Basak and Sumit Mukherjee. Universality of the mean-field for the potts model. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 2015.

[3] B. B. Bhattacharya, S. Ganguly, E. Lubetzky, and Y. Zhao. Upper tails and independence polynomials in random graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.04074*, 2015.

[4] S. Chatterjee and S. R. S. Varadhan. The large deviation principle for the erdosrenyi the large deviation principle for the erdos-renyi random graph. *European J. Comb.*, 32(7):1000–1017, 2011.

[5] Sourav Chatterjee. An introduction to large deviations for random graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.06828*, 2016.

[6] Sourav Chatterjee and Amir Dembo. Nonlinear large deviations. *Advances in Mathematics*, 2016.

[7] F. R. K. Chung and R. L. Graham. Edge-colored complete graphs edge-colored complete graphs with precisely colored subgraphs. *Combinatorica*, 3:315–324, 1983.

[8] Rodney Coleman. *Calculus on Normed Vector Spaces*. Springer New York, 2012.

[9] B. DeMarco and J. Kahn. Tight upper tail bounds for cliques. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 41(4):469–487, 2012.

[10] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. *Large deviations techniques and applications*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, corrected reprint of the second (1998) edition edition, 2010.

[11] Lubetzky E. and Y. Zhao. On the variational problem for upper tails of triangle counts in sparse random graphs. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 2014.

[12] Ronen Eldan. Gaussian-width gradient complexity, reverse log-sobolev inequalities and nonlinear large deviations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.04346*, 2016.

[13] Richard M. Wilson Esther R. Lamken. Decompositions of edge-colored complete graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 89(149-200), 2000.

[14] Svante Janson, Krzysztof Oleszkiewicz, and rzej Rucinski. Upper tails for subgraph counts in random graphs. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 2004.

[15] J. H. Kim and V. H. Vu. Divide and conquer martingales and the number of triangles in a random graph. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 24(2):166–174, 2004.

[16] Kay Kirkpatrick and Tayyab Nawaz. Asymptotics of mean-field o(n) models. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 2016.

[17] Michel Ledoux and Michel Talagrand. *Probability in Banach spaces : isoperimetry and processes*. Springer-Verlag, 1991.

[18] Manfred Opper and David Saad, editors. *Advanced Mean Field Methods Theory and Practice*. MIT Press, 2000.